

## ARTICLE

# Redundancy and Contradiction in Arabic: Non Intended, Non Functional, and Potentially Humorous

*Khaled Abu-Abbas* , *Aseel Al-Omari* 

*Department of English for Applied Studies, Jordan University of Science and Technology, Irbid 22110, Jordan*

## ABSTRACT

This study is a qualitative investigation of special cases of redundant and contradictory expressions in Jordanian Arabic (JA) where the speakers are unaware of the redundancy or contradiction they are using. It is this lack of awareness, we assume, that deprives the expressions of any semantic or pragmatic contribution to the communication event. The data used in this study includes observation of the speech of individuals in various naturalistic settings. In addition, a wide range of social media posts and comments, advertisements and television content are gathered, categorized, and analysis. We analyse the data with reference to the semantic notions of componential analysis and entailment and then categorized. On the one hand, results reveal that unintended redundancies involved either message repetition or entailment. On the other hand, some redundancies are found to lend themselves to negation while others do not. Contradictions are analyzed with reference to the notion of logical incompatibility. Some contradictions are found to be subject to negation while others are not. Results also highlight that such redundancies and contradictions may result in humor unintended by the speaker and only captured by a language critic. This contrasts with other genre-specific humor where humor is intended by the speaker and understood by those who share that genre.

**Keywords:** Componential Analysis; Entailment; Linguistic Humor; Arabic

### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Khaled H. Abu-Abbas, Department of English for Applied Studies, Jordan University of Science and Technology; Email: [Khaled.abuabbas@gmail.com](mailto:Khaled.abuabbas@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23 June 2025 | Revised: 27 June 2025 | Accepted: 1 July 2025 | Published Online: 29 August 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.10644>

### CITATION

Abu-Abbas, K., Al-Omari, A., 2025. Redundancy and Contradiction in Arabic: Non Intended, Non Functional, and Potentially Humorous. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(9): 73–85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i9.10644>

### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

# 1. Introduction

Linguists and non-linguists have discussed redundancy<sup>[1-7]</sup>. Redundancy is a multifaceted phenomenon present in both written language and speech<sup>[2]</sup>. It refers to the unnecessary repetition of words or phrases that do not contribute any new information or meaning<sup>[3]</sup>. Ref.<sup>[4]</sup> argues that anything beyond the bare minimum needed to convey or share information is considered redundant. Ref.<sup>[5]</sup> highlights that when additional information accompanies a crucial message in language, it is considered linguistic redundancy. This redundancy is primarily expressed through message repetition and message entailment. The first type involves using the same words or similar expressions repeatedly, while the second type refers to one language unit containing the information already conveyed by another unit. Overall, all these terms refer to using more words or expressions than needed to communicate a message.

Researchers have come to an initial agreement on how to classify redundancy. According to<sup>[1]</sup>, Non-linguistic redundancy, also known as contextual redundancy, serves as a tool for enhancing communication between individuals, influenced by socio-linguistic and psycho-linguistic factors. In this context, words or phrases are intentionally repeated to aid in communication or to achieve specific rhetorical effects. Ref.<sup>[6]</sup> further categorizes these repetitions as either necessary or unnecessary redundancies. Only those instances of “semantic copying” that enhance the overall language effect are considered necessary, while others fall into the category of unnecessary synonymous repetitions. Ref.<sup>[7]</sup> propose a different classification of redundant expressions where they distinguish between semantic redundancy and structural redundancy. Semantic redundancy involves repeating the meaning conveyed by words or phrases, often due to the repetition or overlap of content words. Structural redundancy, on the other hand, arises primarily from the excessive use of functional words like prepositions and articles.

Heraclitus first introduced the concept of contradiction in philosophy, and it was later expanded by Parmenides and Plato in their writings<sup>[8]</sup>. Contradiction is a semantic relationship that occurs between sentences when they express opposing or contradictory meanings<sup>[9]</sup>. According to<sup>[10]</sup>, contradictions happen when the information conveyed in

two different texts does not match or is incompatible with each other. They have concentrated on contradictions that arise when using (i) negation, (ii) opposite words, or (iii) semantic and contextual information that is related to contrasting discourse. According to<sup>[11]</sup>, the contradiction relation refers to a situation where two entities or things are in conflict with each other. It encompasses various forms of opposition, such as antonyms, negation, and other types of conflicts like differences in knowledge, vocabulary, numbers, or structure. Ref.<sup>[9]</sup> suggest that one way to define the term ‘contradiction’ is to say that sentences A and B are considered contradictory if there is no situation or scenario where both A and B can be true at the same time. This is a strict logical condition for contradiction. According to<sup>[12]</sup>, contradictions happen when the repeated word or phrase can be interpreted in different ways, due to some degree of vagueness present not only in adjectives but also in nouns and verbs. According to<sup>[13]</sup>, contradictions can arise from complex differences in factual expressions, the structure of the text, specific lexical distinctions, and our understanding of the world. Ref.<sup>[14]</sup> states that native speakers sometimes find certain logical contradictions acceptable, particularly borderline contradictions when they involve vague statements with predicates like “Joe is and isn’t tall.”

Entailment, which originates from formal logic, is currently a common concept in the field of semantics. It serves as the foundation for understanding other important semantic relationships such as equivalence and contradiction. It is a common occurrence in everyday conversations, but most people do not usually notice it because they are not aware of its presence<sup>[15]</sup>. Ref.<sup>[16]</sup> explains that entailment occurs when the truth of one statement relies on the truth of another. In other words, the truth of two statements is linked or connected with each other. According to<sup>[17]</sup>, entailment is a term that describes a connection between two sentences. If the first sentence is true, it means the second sentence must also be true. For example, if I say, “I can see a dog”, it entails that “I can see an animal”. You can’t say the first sentence is true while denying the truth of the second sentence. In his basic introduction to linguistic semantics, ref.<sup>[18]</sup> explains entailments as a relationship between two things, p and q. If when p is true, q must also be true (and if p is false, then q must be false), that means p entails q. To put it more simply, “p entails q if p being true means q must also be

true”<sup>[19,20]</sup>. According to<sup>[21]</sup>, entailment refers to something that naturally follows from what was previously mentioned. Furthermore, as explained by<sup>[22]</sup>, entailments are connected to one’s understanding of a specific language and are not dependent on the knowledge of whether something in the real world is true or false.

Language is often implicated in humor. In the field of linguistics, there’s a collection of jokes that stand out not because of what happens or the situations they describe, but because of specific language qualities or “features of natural language” they use to be funny<sup>[23]</sup>.

Humor encompasses diverse modes and can be categorized differently depending on perspective and purpose. Linguistic humor specifically relies on rhetorical devices, such as puns and zeugma to elicit laughter, drawing its humor directly from the language itself. In the context of English linguistic humor, rhetorical devices are applied across phonological, semantic, and syntactic dimensions<sup>[24]</sup>. Language-based jokes often derive their humor from the ambiguities inherent in the English language. Some of these jokes depend on sound similarities (like puns), some hinge on multiple meanings of words, some involve repeating sounds, while others play on similar sentence structures<sup>[25]</sup>.

Linguists have attempted to understand what makes us find things funny<sup>[26]</sup>, how we appreciate humor<sup>[27]</sup>, and how humor helps us deal with difficult situations<sup>[28]</sup>. Humor can be divided into two types: referential and verbal humor. Referential humor relies on the meaning or context of the joke, while verbal humor depends on the specific words or language used. Referential humor creates funny situations by playing with the meaning, while verbal humor uses wordplay or language tricks to create humor by combining different meanings<sup>[25]</sup>. As a method of humor creation, verbal humor makes use of language features; that is, the speaker can alter phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics in order to produce hilarious discourse<sup>[29]</sup>. Wordplay can take different forms like puns, sarcasm, teasing, or playful banter<sup>[30]</sup>.

Further investigations into humor distinguish between semantic, pragmatic, and interactional humor<sup>[2,31–34]</sup>. Semantic humor focuses on meaning of words and linguistic structure to evoke humor. It involves wordplay, ambiguity, or contradiction in the language itself<sup>[2,31]</sup>. Pragmatic humor focuses on context, speaker intent, and social norms. It

depends on how language is used in specific situations, and typically requires shared knowledge between speaker and audience<sup>[32]</sup>. Interactional humor focuses on social dynamics and conversational flow. It emerges from spontaneous exchanges between speakers and often involves timing, role playing, or collaborative joke-building<sup>[33,34]</sup>.

All investigations into language and humor involve the conscious participation and intent of the joke initiator. Wordplay, irony, and role-playing that aim to create a humorous response are all intentional activities on the part of the speaker and/or his/her audience.

This study investigates a form of semantic humor but departs from the traditional analysis by introducing unintended humor resulting from semantic redundancy and contradiction. This form of humor is only captured by a language specialist or critic. It aims to shed light on explaining why certain linguistic structures evoke amusement for linguists yet remain unnoticed by the general population including the speaker.

The discussion attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between humor and contradiction in language?
2. What is the relationship between humor and redundancy in language?
3. What types of humorous redundant expressions are used in Jordanian Arabic?
4. How do redundant and contradictory expressions behave under negation?
5. Why is this type of humor specific to linguists?

## 2. Theoretical Framework

This study employs componential analysis and an exploration of semantic relations in its discussion. Semantics is the study of how language conveys meaning, and it has various approaches. One perspective focuses on the relationship between words and their real-world references, while another considers the impact of a speaker’s emotions and personal interpretations in adding depth to the meaning<sup>[35]</sup>. Identifying semantic relationships between nouns involves recognizing how two nouns are related in context<sup>[36]</sup>. A word or lexeme has a complicated meaning made up of smaller parts. These smaller parts are put together in differ-

ent ways to create different words. The meaning of a word is a complex structure where the different parts of meaning are connected to each other <sup>[37]</sup>. We can better understand the relationships between the meanings of words by using componential analysis. This method suggests that words are not simply single meanings, but rather combinations of different components <sup>[38]</sup>. The concept of componential analysis emerged in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a more efficient approach to understanding meaning. Ref. <sup>[39]</sup> contends that “the meanings of words are analyzed not as unitary concepts but as complexes made up of components of meaning which are themselves semantic primitives”. This means that words are made up of multiple units of meanings, and these units can also have additional sub-meanings. As a result, words can have different relationships with each other depending on the meanings they carry within a text. Componential analysis is useful for understanding the differences in meaning between related words or words in the same category. It involves breaking down the meaning of a word into its smallest distinct parts, which are compared to other parts. It describes word meanings using structured sets of features, which can be “present”, “absent”, or “indifferent” to a certain feature. Binary rules are used to indicate whether a feature is present (+) or absent (–) <sup>[40]</sup>. For example, take the words “women” and “flower”. Their meanings might not seem related at first glance. Lexical semantics assigns the value (+female) to “women” and (– human) to “flower”. However, both words have additional meanings, such as affection, beauty, care, love, and protection for “women”, and beauty, love, and a nice smell for “flower”. The common values between them are love and beauty. So, instead of just being female or non-human, these words exemplify broader meanings like love and beauty. In general, words can be more creative in meaning when considered together, drawing from the relationships between their values <sup>[41]</sup>.

### 3. The Present Study

#### 3.1. Significance of the Study

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to explore unintended, non-functional redundancy and contradiction in Arabic. These will be tested under negation. Potential humor created by such expressions, we believe, creates a new genre of humor. This will depart from the

ordinary genre-specific investigations of humor as the humorous expressions used in the study are produced by the common language user with no intention of being humorous. This requires detailed experimentation and analysis to validate the observation and is left for future research.

#### 3.2. Data Collection Procedures

The primary method used for data collection involved an observational process where a panel of three linguists systematically tested examples extracted from individuals’ speech in diverse, naturalistic settings during their daily activities. These linguists, using their expertise, identified the amusing attributes of specific expressions, revealing nuances that were not necessarily intended as redundant or contradictory by the speakers.

Expanding the scope of data collection, the analysis extended to a diverse dataset encompassing social media comments, posts, television broadcasts, and advertisements. The linguists conducted a thorough examination, employing a systematic categorization and tabulation approach to analyze the linguistic expressions. This process involved creating detailed lists and classifications, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of the intricacies that make these expressions amusing to say the least. The categorization and tabulation aimed to unveil the underlying patterns and complexities inherent in the data.

Since the focus of the study is qualitative, no statistics related to quantity of each type observed is given. Hundreds of examples were initially collected, but only those approved by all three linguists are discussed.

### 4. Discussion

#### 4.1. Redundancy

Based on the analysis of the collected data, redundant phrases were identified to be used by people in their everyday conversations or on the web in different situations. As mentioned before, redundancy involves unnecessary repetition of words or phrases that does not add any new information to the overall meaning. Componential analysis is used to show how words have multiple pieces (components) of meanings which together create the complete meaning of the word. It involves breaking down

the meaning of a word or phrase into its smallest parts, which are then compared to other parts in other words. Entailment is also employed to help understand the relationship between sentences or words to make judgments

about their true values.

**Table 1** below shows selected examples of redundant phrases which will later be expanded and categorized into different types.

**Table 1.** Redundant Phrases.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
be:t mustaqill	Detached house
haqiiqa s'ahiiha	True fact
raabit <sup>c</sup> muftarak	Shared link
mustaqbal mad3huul	Unknown future
s'adiiq d3ayyid	Good friend
?i?aa?a kaa?ibe	False rumor
mustaqsa'ida ?amdan	Intentionally on purpose
?unfux labarra	Blow outwards
wah? muxiif	Scary monster
?ikrayaat ilmaad'i	Memories from the past
?ixwaat banaat	Female sisters
hadiyye mad3d3aaniyye	Free gift

Using componential analysis, we first break words or phrases into their constituent parts.

**Example:**

*hadiyye mad3d3aaniyye*

Gift free

'Free gift.'

Free: This component implies costing nothing, or not needing to be paid for.

Gift: This component implies something that you give without getting anything in return.

"Free gift" is redundant because of the inherent meaning in its individual components. "Free" indicates something that doesn't require payment and "gift" by nature is something that is given without getting anything in return. Therefore, the redundancy here is due to using "free" and "gift" together as each term encompasses the meaning of the other.

Also, "Gift" entails "Free": if something is a "gift", it necessarily means that it is "free".

"Free gift" is humorous to a linguist because of the inherent redundancy. This example, along with the subsequent examples can be seen as humorous only by linguists.

### 4.1.1. Types of Redundancy

Redundant phrases were categorized into Essential redundancies: phrases with obligatory repetition, descriptive redundancies, and redundancies with matching meanings.

#### Essential Redundancies: Phrases with Obligatory Repetition

The following redundant phrases include words that are commonly used together by people on most occasions.

**Example:**

*raabit<sup>c</sup> muftarak*

link shared

'shared link'

Link: This component implies that two or more things have a connection 'similarity' in an aspect or more.

Shared: This component suggests something(s) are in common.

"Shared link" is redundant because it includes two words that convey a similar meaning or action. Both "shared" and "link" imply something is in common. The word "link" itself already suggests the idea of 'shared' and thus "shared" is an unnecessary repetition. However, the two words often occur together although it is possible to

say *raabit*<sup>c</sup> without *muftarak*.

**Table 2** below shows more examples of phrases with

obligatory repetition. People use these words together al-

most always in their communication.

**Table 2.** Essential Redundancies: Phrases with Obligatory Repetition.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
fii fuʕuur dʒuwwaati	There is a feeling inside me
nidmidʒhum maʕ baʕad <sup>c</sup>	Merge them together
tʕaawanu maʕ baʕad <sup>c</sup>	Collaborate together
raabit <sup>c</sup> muftarak	Shared link

### Descriptive Redundancies

The following phrases contain redundancies that are descriptive, where one word in the phrase describes the other word.

#### Example:

haqiiqa sʕahiiha

fact true

‘True fact’

True: This component implies something that is based on what is real, or actual.

Fact: This component implies something that has an actual existence.

In this example “True” describes “fact”, but a “fact” is something that is “true” by definition. Therefore, “True fact” is redundant because the component “fact” itself already implies something that is true or verifiable. Also, “fact” entails “true”: if something is a “fact”, it necessarily means that it is “true”.

**Table 3** below shows more examples of descriptive redundancies.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Redundancies.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
be:t mustaqqil	Detached howuse
sʕadiiq dʒayyid	Good friend
?ixwaat banaat	Female sisters
hadiyye madʒdʒaaniyye	Free gift
mufaadaʒa?a ye:r mutawaqqaʕa	Unexpected surprise
tahdʒiir qasʕri	Compulsory displacement

### Redundancies with Matching Meanings

#### Example:

haamil fiiha baby

pregnant in her a baby

‘pregnant with a baby.’

Pregnant: This component is confirms having a baby in the mother’s womb.

With a baby: This component simply confirms having

a baby.

“Pregnant” and “in her a baby” in Arabic have the same meaning. One can say “She is pregnant” or “There is a baby in her” to mean essentially the same thing. This equivalent to English “ She is pregnant” and “ She is with child”. Most such expression involve some type of a paraphrase.

**Table 4** below shows more examples of redundancies with matching meanings.

**Table 4.** Redundancies with Matching Meanings.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
haamil fiiha baby	Pregnant with a baby
tʕariiqa sahle ye:r muʕaqqade	An easy, uncomplicated method
lahaali biduun hada	Alone without anyone
ʕaruus mitzawdʒe dʒdiid	Newly married bride
yani maʕu masʕaari	Rich with money
madʒbuurah yaʕbin ʕannik	Forced against your will
fard <sup>c</sup> alhidʒaab alqasʕri	Imposed compulsory veil
taʕaadul salbi biduun ?ahdaaf	A negative draw without goals



#### 4.1.2. Redundancies and Negation

Redundant expressions behave differently under negation. Some may be negated to create a contradiction while others are not subject to negation. Negation may be achieved using a negative particle, or an opposite word.

##### Redundancies That Can Be Negated

The following redundant phrases can be negated, and when negated, they can be seen as contradictory. The negation of such redundant phrases is also used by people in their communication.

##### Example:

*ħall*            *s'ahiiħ*

Solution      correct

'Correct solution'

Correct: This component implies something that is accurate or true, without any mistakes.

Solution: This component implies an answer to a problem.

"Correct solution" is redundant because "solution" inherently implies an answer to a problem and correctness, and "correct" is already something that is true, without any mistakes. So, the word "solution" encompasses the mean-

ing of "correct". Also, "solution" entails "correct": if something is a "solution", it necessarily means that is "correct". When negating this phrase, it becomes contradictory as below:

*ħall*            *xaa t'i?*

solution      incorrect

'Incorrect solution'

Incorrect: This component implies something that is not accurate or true.

Solution: This component implies an answer to a problem.

"Incorrect solution" is contradictory because "solution" is an answer to a problem which implies that it is expected to be correct by definition, and "incorrect" implies something that is not true or accurate. "Incorrect solution" combines two concepts that conflict with each other. It typically means a solution that is not correct or accurate. Also, "solution" does not entail "incorrect": if something is a "solution", it must mean that it is "correct", and it is not the case in this example.

**Table 5** below shows more examples of redundancies that can be negated.

**Table 5.** Redundancies that Can Be Negated

Example in Arabic		Literal Meaning	
Normal	Negated	Normal	Negated
ʔijaaʕa kaaðibe	ʔijaaʕa s'aħe:hah	False rumor	True rumor
waaqif haqiiqi	waqaf ye:r haqiiqi	Real reality	Unreal reality
wahf muxiif	wahf ye:r muxiif	Scary monster	Non-scary monster
ħaqiiqa s'ahiiħa	ħaqiiqa ye:r s'ahiiħa	True fact	Untrue fact

##### Redundancies That Cannot Be Negated

The following redundant phrases cannot be negated. People do not use the negation of these phrases in their communication nor negate them at all. And if negated, they

can't be seen as contradictory as the previous examples. They are just seen as redundant.

**Table 6** below shows some examples of redundant phrases that can't be negated.

**Table 6.** Redundancies that Cannot Be Negated.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
ʔixwaat banaat	Female sisters.
ðikrayaat ilmaad'i	Memories of the past
mistaqs'id ʕamdan	Intentionally on purpose

## 4.2. Contradiction

Considering the analysis of collected data, the following contradictory phrases were found to be used by people in their everyday communication, either in person or on the web. As mentioned before, contradiction is a semantic relation where sentences, phrases, or words have opposing or different meanings. People say and use these contradictory phrases without paying attention to the contradiction in the literal meaning of the words. Linguists, on the other hand, find these contradictory phrases humorous because of their ability to see details about words and phrases that other people do not see. Componential analysis is followed to show how words have multiple meanings and combinations of different components. It involves breaking down the meaning of a word or phrase into its smallest parts, which are

then compared to other parts. Entailment is also employed to help understand the relationship between sentences or words to make judgments about their true values. Contradiction will also be examined through the incongruity theory, which states that humor emerges from perceiving incongruity or inconsistency between elements, eliciting surprise and amusement. The application of this theory to contradiction entails identifying the unexpected or conflicting elements within linguistic expressions. In many examples, there might be a pragmatic justification for the contradiction, but the speaker is typically unaware of it. Essentially, the linguist finds humor in the speaker's lack of awareness. If the linguist desires, they can playfully point out the contradiction or provide a sarcastic or mocking commentary.

**Table 7** below shows examples of contradictory phrases.

**Table 7.** Phrases with Contradictory Words.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
buḡraa ye:r saarra	Unpleasant good news
ʔihkuu biduun s'o:t	Talk without sound
ʔihtimaal mustahiil ys'iir	A possibility that is impossible to happen
ʔaxis'aaʔi ʔaam	General specialist
s'adiiq sayyiʔ	Bad friend
hal xaat'iʔ	Wrong solution
lo:nu jaffaaf	Its color is transparent
namat' ʔafwaaʔi	Random pattern
ʔadwiye mud'irra	Harmful medicine
ʔibtisaamtuh hazi:ne	His smile is sad
ʔissirr makʔuuf	The secret is uncovered
ʔid'aaʔa muʔtime	Dark light

### Example:

*luyz waad'ih*

riddle obvious

'Obvious riddle'

Obvious: This component implies something that is easy to understand or recognize.

Riddle: This component implies something that is confusing, or a problem that is difficult to solve.

"Obvious riddle" is contradictory because "obvious" by definition means something that is easy to understand or recognize, while "riddle" implies something that is confusing or a problem that is difficult to solve or understand. Both meanings contradict each other. Also, "riddle" does

not entail "obvious": if it is a "riddle" it cannot be "obvious".

The inherent contradiction of "obvious riddle" aligns with the incongruity theory of humor, where amusement arises from unexpected and conflicting elements within language. The unexpected blend of clear and confusing contributes to the humor.

It is important to note that some riddles may appear as "obvious" to some individuals, but the focus here is on the literal semantics of the expression "obvious riddle".

Regarding contradiction and negation: Contradictions behave differently under negation. Some can be negated creating redundancies while others are not subject to negation.



#### 4.2.1. Contradictions That Can Be Negated

The following contradictory phrases can be negated, and when negated, they can be seen as redundant (Table 8). The negation of such phrases is also used by people in their communication.

**Example:**

*haadiθ mutaʕammad*  
accident intentional  
‘Intentional accident’

Intentional: This component implies something planned or intended.

Accident: This component implies something that happens by chance, without anyone intending or planning it.

This phrase is contradictory because “intentional” means something planned or intended and “accident”, by definition, means something that happens by chance. So, this combination of meanings implies something that is in-

tentional and accidental at the same time making the phrase contradictory. When negating this phrase, it becomes redundant as below:

*haadiθ ye:r mutaʕammad*  
accident un intentional  
‘Unintentional accident’

Unintentional: This component implies not done by intention or design.

Accident: This component implies something that happens by chance, without anyone intending or planning it.

This phrase is redundant because “accident” already inherently conveys something that happens without anyone intending or planning it. Adding “unintentional” makes the phrase redundant because it means something that is not done by intention. Also, “accident” entails “unintentional”, if something is an accident, it necessarily means that it is unintentional.

Table 8. Contradictions that Can Be Negated.

Example in Arabic		Literal Meaning	
Not Negated	Negated	Not Negated	Negated
ʕilaadʒ mudʕirr	ʕilaadʒ miʃ mudʕirra	Harmful treatment (medicine)	Harmless treatment (medicine)
muxaatʕara ʔaaminah	muxaatʕara ye:r ʔaamina	Safe risk	Unsafe risk
luyz waadʕih	luyz miʃ waadʕih	Obvious riddle	Unclear riddle
sʕadiaq sayyiʔ	sʕadi:q ye:r sayyiʔ	Bad friend	Not a bad friend
hall xaatʕiʔ	hall sʕahiih	Wrong solution	Not a wrong solution
huduuʔ muzʕidʒ	huduuʔ miʃ muzʕidʒ	Annoying calm	Not an annoying calm
ʔissirr makʕuuf	ʔissirr miʃ makʕuuf	The secret is uncovered	The secret is not uncovered
haadiθ mutaʕammad	haadiθ ye:r mutaʕammad	Intentional accident	Unintentional accident

#### 4.2.2. Contradictions That Cannot Be Negated

The following contradictory phrases cannot be negated. People do not use the negation of these in their communication nor negate them at all (Table 9).

Table 9. Contradictions that Cannot Be Negated.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
ʔaxisʕsʕaaʔi ʕaam	General specialist
waaqiʕ ʔiftiraadʕi	Virtual reality

#### 4.3. Redundancy and Contradiction: Phrases Combining English and Arabic Words

##### 4.3.1. Redundancies That Include Phrases with English and Arabic Overlap

The following examples include redundant phrases with an English and Arabic overlap.

**Example:**

*New look dzdiid*  
New look new

‘New look’

This phrase is redundant because it combines both Arabic and English words to convey the same meaning. “New look” already conveys the idea of something new. Adding “d3diid” makes the phrase redundant because it repeats the same concept which results in a reduplication in meaning.

**Table 10** below shows more examples of redundancies with English and Arabic overlap where overlapping expressions are in bold face.

**Table 10.** Redundancies that Include Phrases with English and Arabic Overlap.

Example in Arabic	Literal Meaning
Mc <b>Chicken</b> d3aad3	McChicken Chicken
ʃasʔaayit il selfie <b>stick</b>	Selfie Stick Stick
<b>Car</b> seat issiyyaara	Car Seat of the Car
ʃasʔiir <b>fresh</b> tʔaazad3	Juice Fresh Fresh
<b>Cheeseburger</b> d3ibnih	Cheeseburger Cheese
<b>Hot</b> chocolate <b>suxun</b>	Hot Chocolate Hot
ʃardʔ il cake <b>show</b>	Cake Show Show
tʔalabit <b>order</b>	I Ordered an Order
Thank <b>you</b> kti:r ʔilak	Thank you very much to you
bil <b>weekend</b> nihayit ilʔusbuuʃ	In the weekend end of the week

Such phrases combining both Arabic and English words are redundant due to the repetition of words with the same meanings, and they do not serve any practical purpose. As seen in the examples, these phrases included the same word meaning in Arabic and English twice, once in Arabic and once in English, making the phrase redundant. People use them without noticing the repetition when using mixing both languages. They are basically repeating the same exact word, which is common in their everyday communication.

#### 4.3.2. Contradictions That Include Phrases with English and Arabic Overlap

The following examples include contradictory phrases with an English and Arabic overlap.

Example:

<i>Cheeseburger</i>	<i>biduun</i>	<i>d3ibnih</i>
Cheeseburger	without	cheese
‘Cheeseburger without cheese’		

This phrase is contradictory because (cheeseburger) refers to a type of burger that includes cheese. “Cheeseburger without cheese” is contradictory because a cheeseburger, by

definition, includes cheese. Such phrases combining both Arabic and English words are contradictory due a disparity in meaning, this contradiction appears when the phrase includes one word in English with its contradictory meaning in Arabic, or vice versa. The same goes for **iced** Spanish latte **suxun** ‘Hot iced Spanish latte’

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

Redundancy and contradiction are rhetorical devices employed to achieve specific functions. Nevertheless, some instances of contradiction and redundancy do not seem to add any semantic or pragmatic functions and thus become rather amusing for a linguist. The relationship between redundancy and humor is evident in situations where redundant phrases, though often unnoticed by normal speakers in their everyday communication, inherently carry humor due to their unnecessary repetition. The relationship between humor and contradiction can be observed in instances where contradictions, though often unnoticed by normal speakers in their everyday communication, are inherently humorous due to their semantic incongruity. Specialized linguists have the ability to notice these contradictions, thereby eliciting humor.

Some redundancies can be negated resulting in contradictions. Both the redundant expression and its negated form are used by people in their communication. Other redundancies can’t be negated. Redundant phrases with obligatory repetition included instances in which certain words are constantly used together by people in their communication, they almost always come together, and one of the words encompasses the meaning of the other. Descriptive redundancies included redundancies where one word in the phrase describes the other, adding a description that is already inherent in the other word. Redundancies with matching meanings included redundant phrases where the two words have very similar meanings, almost identical, resulting in redundancy.

Contradictions included phrases where one word contradicts the meaning of the other. Some contradictions can be negated resulting in redundancies. Both the contradictions and their negatives are used in communication. Other contradictions can’t be negated.

Redundancies that include phrases with English and Arabic overlap included phrases combining English and Arabic words that have the same exact meaning, meaning

that a phrase that includes a word in English with its same exact meaning in Arabic, or vice versa. Contradictions that include phrases with English and Arabic overlap included phrases combining English and Arabic words that contradicts each other, meaning that a phrase that includes a word in English with its opposite in Arabic, or vice versa.

It was found that a specialized linguist can detect the humor in these redundant and contradictory phrases, whereas other people neither perceive the humor nor intend to be humorous at all. On the one hand, humor from a linguistic perspective differs from humor in other fields. For instance, doctors and engineers make jokes and find them funny because they use specialized terminology or jargon that they use that are less accessible to people who do not work in those fields. A linguist, on the other hand, has the ability to detect humor in ordinary language use and notice details that other people miss. This contrasts with those in other fields who rely on specific terminology to detect the humor.

Future work can focus on quantity of expressions used under each category discussed and other categorizations if necessary. Further tests related to behavior of redundant and contradictory expressions under morphological or syntactic phenomena could be carried out. Future work might consider interviews or inferential validation tests to validate the results of this study and show how such expressions are received by native speakers.

## Author contributions

Conceptualization, K.A.-A.; methodology, K.A.-A. and A.A.-O.; analysis and interpretation, K.A.-A. and A.A.-O.; resources, A.A.-O.; writing—original draft preparation, K.A.-A. and A.A.-O.; writing—review and editing, K.A.-A. and A.A.-O.; supervision, K.A.-A. Both authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This work received no external funding.

## Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

## Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

## Data Availability Statement

The data used in the study is incorporated in the manuscript.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Wit, E.C., Gillette, M., 1999. What is linguistic redundancy? Technical Report. Available from: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=182d3980d8f41616da690d607f6f980dbf582352>. <https://www.math.rug.nl/~ernst/linguistics/redundancy3.pdf> (cited 23 June 2023)
- [2] Benczes, R., 2014. Repetitions which are not repetitions: the non-redundant nature of tautological compounds. *English Language & Linguistics*. 18(3), 431–447. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674314000112>
- [3] Harmianthy, T., 2016. An analysis study of redundancies made by students in writing descriptive text. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa (JOM) Bidang Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*. 1(1). Available from: <https://jom.unpak.ac.id/index.php/bahasainggris/article/view/232/0> (cited 23 June 2023)
- [4] Rosie, A.M., 1973. *Information and communication theory*, 2nd ed. Van Nostrand-Reinhold: New York, NY, USA.
- [5] Xu, S.H., 1984. The redundancy of language. *Modern Foreign Languages*. 2, 3–8.
- [6] Wang, F.X., 2001. *English-Chinese comparative semantics*. Foreign Language Press: Beijing, China.
- [7] Liu, Y.Z., Xiang, Y.H., 2018. A study on redundancy in English majors' compositions. *Journal of Educational Institute of Jilin Province*. 34(9), 71–4.
- [8] Karlova-Bourbonus, N., 2018. Automatic detection of contradictions in texts [Ph.D. Thesis]. Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen. Available from: <https://jlupub.uni-giessen.de/server/api/core/bitstreams/42626296-e223-4cf4-a9ab-134c4489fbc4/content> (cited 12 June 2023)
- [9] De Marneffe, M.C., Rafferty, A.N., Manning, C.D.,

2008. Finding contradictions in text. *Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT*; Columbus, OH, USA; 16–18 June 2008. pp. 1039–1047.
- [10] Harabagiu, S., Hickl, A., Lacatusu, F., 2006. Negation, contrast, and contradiction in text processing. *AAAI*. 6, 755–762.
- [11] Rahimi, Z., ShamsFard, M., 2021. Contradiction detection in Persian text. *arXiv preprint. arXiv:2107.0198*.
- [12] Snider, T., 2015. Using tautologies and contradictions. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*. 19, 610–627. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18148/sub/2015.v19i0.252>
- [13] Marques, R., 2015. Detecting contradictions in news quotations [Ph.D. Thesis]. IST, University of Lisbon: Lisboa, Portugal.
- [14] Alxatib, S., Pagin, P., Sauerland, U., 2013. Acceptable contradictions: pragmatics or semantics? A reply to Cobreros et al. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*. 42, 619–634. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-012-9228-4>
- [15] Pangaribuan, M., 2022. An analysis of entailment found on cosmetic and fast food advertisements. *JETAL Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. 4(1), 19–26.
- [16] Griffiths, P., 2006. Introduction to English semantics and pragmatics. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, UK. Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/41053751/Patrick\\_Griffiths\\_An\\_Introduction\\_to\\_English\\_Semantics\\_and\\_Pragmatics](https://www.academia.edu/41053751/Patrick_Griffiths_An_Introduction_to_English_Semantics_and_Pragmatics) (cited 6 August 2023)
- [17] Crystal, D., 1998. A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics, 6th ed. Blackwell: Oxford, UK. Available from: <https://hslcorner.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/david-crystal-a-dictionary-of-linguistics-and-phonetics-1.pdf> (cited 27 August 2023)
- [18] Lyons, J., 1995. Linguistic semantics: an introduction. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK. Available from: [https://www.grammainstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Linguistic-Semantics\\_-An-Introduction-PDFDrive-.pdf](https://www.grammainstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Linguistic-Semantics_-An-Introduction-PDFDrive-.pdf) (cited 18 June 2023)
- [19] Huang, Y., 2007. Pragmatics. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/42707174/The\\_oxford\\_book\\_Pragmatics\\_by\\_Yan\\_Huang](https://www.academia.edu/42707174/The_oxford_book_Pragmatics_by_Yan_Huang) (cited 26 May 2023)
- [20] Levinson, S.C., 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press. Available from: <https://uogbooks.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/138865467-pragmatics-levinson-1.pdf> (cited 29 July 2023)
- [21] Yule, G., 1998. Explaining English grammar: a guide to explaining grammar for teachers of English as a second or foreign language. Oxford University Press: Cambridge, UK. Available from: <https://www.scribd.com/document/358714931/Explaining-English-Grammar-George-Yule-PDF> (cited 18 May 2023)
- [22] Rambaud, M.G., 2012. Basic semantics. Editorial UNED: Madrid, Spain.
- [23] Zabalbeascoa, P., 2016. Translating jokes for dubbed television situation comedies. *The Translator*. 2(2), 235–257. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1996.10798976>
- [24] Han, Q., 2011. On untranslatability of English linguistic humor. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*. 1(2), 149–152.
- [25] Mukherjee, P., 2018. Contingency of humor on linguistics and language. *International Journal of English Learning & Teaching Skills*. 1(2), 114–120. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15864/ijelts.1203>
- [26] Martin, G.N., Sullivan, E., 2013. Sense of humor across cultures: a comparison of British, Australian, and American respondents. *North American Journal of Psychology*. 15(2), 375.
- [27] Carretero-Dios, H., Ruch, W., 2010. Humor appreciation and sensation seeking: invariance of findings across culture and assessment instrument? *Humor*. 23(4), 427–445. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMR.2010.020>
- [28] Samson, A.C., Gross, J.J., 2012. Humour as emotion regulation: the differential consequences of negative versus positive humour. *Cognition & Emotion*. 26(2), 375–384. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2011.585069>
- [29] Romadlani, M.M.I., 2021. A manipulation of semantic meanings as a humor construction strategy. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*. 15(2), 293–304. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.28637>
- [30] Schwarz, J., 2009. Linguistic aspects of verbal humor in stand-up comedy [Ph.D. Thesis]. Universität des Saarlandes: Saarbrücken, Germany.
- [31] Raskin, V., 1985. Semantic mechanisms of humor. Reidel: Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- [32] Yus, F., 2003. Humor and the search for relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35(9), 1295–1331. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00179-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00179-0)
- [33] Norrick, N.R., 1993. Conversational joking: humor in everyday talk. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, Indiana.
- [34] Hay, J., 2001. The pragmatics of humor support. *Humor*. 14(1), 55–82. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2001.006>
- [35] Emodi, L.N., 2011. A semantic analysis of the lan-

- guage of advertising. *African Research Review*. 5(4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v5i4.69286>
- [36] Rozovskaya, A., Girju, R., 2009. Identifying semantic relations in context: near-misses and overlaps. *Proceedings of the International Conference RANLP*. pp. 381–387. Available from: <https://aclanthology.org/R09-1069/> (cited 9 July 2023)
- [37] Crystal, D., 1987. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [38] Aziz, F.H., 2023. Componential analysis to John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men*'s characterization: a semantico-stylistic study. *Hawlyat Al-Montada*. 1(53), 61.
- [39] Kempson, R.M., 1977. *Semantic theory*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK. Available from: <https://books.google.la/books?id=nPRAUZvxaS-8C&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false> (cited 10 June 2023)
- [40] Saeed, J.I., 2009. *Semantics*, 3rd ed. Wiley Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, USA. Available from: [https://www.academia.edu/25250981/Saeed\\_john\\_i\\_semantics](https://www.academia.edu/25250981/Saeed_john_i_semantics) (cited 11 May 2023)
- [41] Belfarhi, K., 2013. The componential analysis of literary meaning. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*. 15(2), 288–301. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14483/udis-trital.jour.calj.2013.2.a010>